

27th July 1964] [திரு. பூ. கக்கன்]

நிபுணர்களை அனுப்பி சில விஷயங்களைத் தெரிந்துகொண்டுவரச் செய்து கால்நடைகளை நோயிலிருந்து பாதுகாக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்திருக்கிறோம். மாடுகளை நன்றாகக் கவனிப்பதற்கும் அவற்றுக்கு எந்த விதமான நோயும் வராமல் தடுக்கவும், தக்க நடவடிக்கை அரசாங்கம் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளும் என்று தெரிவித்து, இந்த மசோதாவை நிறைவேற்றிக்கொடுக்குமாறு கேட்டுக்கொள்கின்றேன்.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“That the Madras Rinderpest (Amendment) Bill, 1964, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clauses 2 and 3 were put and carried.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI P. KAKKAN : Sir, I move—

“That the Madras Rinderpest (Amendment) Bill, 1964, be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS—cont.

(3) THE MADRAS LEASEHOLDS (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) AMENDMENT BILL, 1964.

MR. SPEAKER : I have to announce to the House that the Governor has given his recommendation for the introduction in and consideration by the Legislative Assembly of the Madras Leaseholds (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill 24 of 1964).

V. GOVERNMENT BILLS—cont.

(4) THE MADRAS LEASEHOLDS (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) AMENDMENT BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 24 OF 1960).

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

“That the Madras Leaseholds (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1964^a be taken into consideration.”

Section 5 of the Madras Leaseholds (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963 (Madras Act XXVII of 1963), provides that the Government shall appoint a Settlement Officer to carry out survey and settlement operations in leaseholds and introduce

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary, dated 21st July 1964.

[Sri. V. Ramaiah]

[27th July 1964]

ryotwari settlement therein. According to the First Schedule to the Act there are twelve leaseholds in the State and they lie in three districts, namely, Madras, Chingleput and Salem. If there are any other leaseholds in any other part of the State, the Government have power under Section 2 of the Act to include them in the First Schedule to the Act. It is considered that on administrative grounds it may not be possible for one Settlement Officer to carry out survey and settlement operations in all leaseholds in the State and that more than one Settlement Officer may have to be appointed to cope with the large volume of work involved. It is, therefore, proposed to amend section 5 of the Act so as to enable the Government to appoint more than one Settlement Officer when necessary. A similar provision has also been proposed in a Bill to amend the Madras Minor Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963, which has been passed by this House.

Sir, I request the House to accept the motion.

SRI C. CHIRANJEEVULU NAIDU : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say a few words on L.A. Bill No. 24 of 1964, which is before the House for consideration.

Sir, in the statement of objects and reasons, it has been stated that one Settlement Officer will not be enough to do the Survey and Settlement work in respect of lease-holds villages. In doing Survey and Settlement work in villages, we have seen, out of experience in the Zamindari Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari, several lapses have been found and misclassifications have taken place in the survey work. The Survey Department are not having proper co-ordination with the Settlement Officers in classifying the lands, which were being actually enjoyed by the ryots as assessed waste land. The ryots are very often representing about this misclassification. The Government should take care in properly classifying the lands by taking into consideration the 'Adangal' and 'chittas' made available by the Village Officers. The Settlement Officers were issuing only rough pattas to the ryots by giving 15 days' time to raise their objection. They are not properly published in the villages and the ryots were not in a position to point out that particular land has been misclassified. For this, it has been stated that one Settlement Officer will carry out survey and settlement. I don't know whether there is Director of Settlement There is only Director of Survey. When the ryots approach Settlement authorities for certain rectifications they usually say that the particular land has been misclassified and that has to be done by the Revenue Department. Therefore, I request that the Settlement Officers should be given proper powers to the effect that the survey and settlement should be done by him. Instead of giving 15 days' time, the ryots may be given 3 months time and the pattas should also be published with sketch, so that it may enable the ryots to know the correct position. I, therefore, request the Government at least at this stage to take steps in this regard. Even though the villages have been converted into ryotwari more than 12 to 13

27th July 1964]

[Sri C. Chiranjeevulu Naidu]

years are over still we see several representations and troubles due to defective survey and settlement. The Government may, therefore, properly define the powers of Settlement Officers and also provide facilities to the ryots to represent their grievances to the Settlement Officers.

Thank you, Sir.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : The points raised by the hon Member, Sri Chiranjeevulu Naidu, are not mainly pertaining to this Bill. These are all general matters. If the hon. Member writes to me, I will consider those points and also the difficulties experienced by the ryots in the Survey and Settlement.

As far as this Bill is concerned, it is just to expedite the survey and settlement work, one Settlement Officer has to be appointed. It will enable them to do better survey and settlement. As far as general remarks are concerned, I once again inform the hon. Member that I will look into the difficulties, if he writes to me.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“ That the Madras Lease-holds (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 24 of 1964) be taken into consideration.

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clauses 2 and 3 were put and carried.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were put and carried.” 10-30 a.m.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras Lease-holds (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 24 of 1964) be passed.

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

(5) THE MADRAS GENERAL SALES TAX (SECOND AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 29 OF 1964).

*THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

“ That the Madras General Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 29 of 1964) be taken into consideration.”

கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த மசோதாவிலே சில திருத்தங்களை நம்முடைய விற்பனை வரிச் சட்டத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர முன் வந்திருக்கிறோம்.